

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated March 14, 2008. Claims 1-41 are pending. The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0098315 (“Haynes”). No new matter has been added. Claims 1-41 were amended for clarity.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

I. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS UNDER 37 CFR § 1.83(a)

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants have removed all references to “display areas” in the claims. Applicants have added references to “module” and “area” to the claims. Applicants submit that the drawings show multiple modules, such as at least the modules 410a-d in Figs. 4A-B. The Specification supports the amended claimed language by stating, “access to each control panel may be grouped into modules.” Specification, ¶49. Applicants further submit that the drawings show multiple “areas,” such as at least the areas 440a-c in Figs. 4A and 4B. The Specification supports the amended claim language by stating, “user interface 403 also includes additional areas (generally 440) for presentation of commerce information associated with the business' site.” Specification, ¶54.

Applicants have not removed the references to first and second “control panels.” Applicants submit that the drawings show multiple “control panels,” such as at least the control panels 210, 215, 220, 225, 230, 235, and 240 in Figs. 2 and 3, control panel 505 in Fig. 5A, control panel 510 in Fig. 5B, control panel 515 in Fig. 5C, control panel 520 in Fig. 5D, and control panel 525 in Fig. 5E. Applicants further submit that the modifiers of “first,” and “second,” are used in the claims for clarity, i.e., to distinguish between two control panels in the claims, such as any two of the control panels listed above.

Applicants submit that the drawings support a “first control panel” and a “second control panel” within the meaning of 37 CFR § 1.83(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection of the drawings.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically the Examiner stated, “[t]he limitations of ‘first display area’, ‘second display area’, ‘third display area’, ‘first control panel’, ‘second control panel’ lack written description in the specification.” Office Action dated March 14, 2008, page 3. Applicants have amended the claims with regard to the “display areas.” However, Applicants submit that the specification provides support for multiple “control panels,” such as at least the control panels 210, 215, 220, 225, 230, 235, and 240 in Figs. 2 and 3, control panel 505 in Fig. 5A, control panel 510 in Fig. 5B, control panel 515 in Fig. 5C, control panel 520 in Fig. 5D, and control panel 525 in Fig. 5E. Applicants further submit that the modifiers of “first,” and “second,” are used in the claims for clarity to distinguish between any two control panels, such as any two of the panels listed above.

Applicants submit that the drawings support a “first control panel” and a “second control panel” within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection of the drawings.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1-29. Claims 1-10 and 25-29 are directed towards building a user interface for a business operating a web-based storefront and providing the user interface to a user over a network. Applicants submit that building a user interface for a business operating a web-based storefront and providing the interface to a user over a network is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 11-17 are directed towards a computer readable medium storing executable instructions. Applicants submit that a computer readable medium with instructions stored therein is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 18-24 are directed

towards building a control mechanism for a business operating a web based storefront and providing the control mechanism to a user over a network. Applicants submit that building a control mechanism and providing the control mechanism to a user over a network is statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of claims 1-29 in light of the above amendments.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haynes. Haynes generally relates to “conducting sales transactions involving the sale of items.” Haynes, ¶2. Haynes discloses “the buyer screens as shown in FIGS. 3A through 3W and the vendor screens as shown in FIGS. 4A through 4I.” Haynes, ¶48. Thus, the screens disclosed in FIGS. 3A through 3W relate to a buyer of items, not to managing or creating a web based storefront, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 30, 33, 36, and 39; and the screens disclosed in FIGS. 4A through 4I relate to a vendor of items, not managing or creating a web based storefront, as claimed. Haynes further discloses “[t]he homepage 390 [FIG. 4b] lists the potential activities in which the supplier may engage by actuating one of the buttons 391a to k.” Haynes does not teach providing a user interface to a user over a network that includes **both** a module providing access to control panels and an area displaying information associated with the commerce involving the web-based storefront, as claimed in independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 30, 33, 36, and 39.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 18, 25, 30, 33, 36, and 39, and all claims that depend thereon.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated March 14, 2008 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

June 6, 2008
Date

/Michael G. Dreznes/
Michael G. Dreznes
Registration No. 59,965

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200